

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, and 14 were pending in the application. By this amendment, claims 1 and 6 are amended. Claim 6 is amended to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection only and not to distinguish over the cited art. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 6 may be found in the specification and claims as originally filed. Thus, no new matter is added and claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, and 14 are pending and at issue.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

By this amendment, independent claims 1 and 6 no longer recite a limitation of "a regulator valve" in the body of claims 1 and 6. Thus, the applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 3-6, and 8-10 particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention and the § 112 rejection is now moot.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

The applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1, 3, and 5 as anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 5,047,965 to Zlokovitz ("Zlokovitz"). "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Each of claims 1, 3, and 5 now recites a pressure loaded pilot valve system comprising, an exhaust line connecting a servo control valve assembly to an outlet line, the exhaust line carrying fluid at an exhaust pressure from the servo control valve assembly to the outlet line. Zlokovitz fails to disclose this element

Zlokovitz discloses a microprocessor controlled gas pressure regulator having a pilot valve that is controlled, in part, by an electronically adjustable regulator valve that is under the control of a microprocessor. The electronically adjustable regulator valve supplies pressurized fluid to the pilot valve to control the position of the pilot valve and thus, the gas pressure regulator. See Zlokovitz abstract and col. 3. lines 28-36. However, Zlokovitz fails to disclose an exhaust line connecting the electronically adjustable regulator valve to an outlet line, the exhaust line carrying fluid at an exhaust pressure from the electronically adjustable regulator valve to an outlet line.

The patent office suggests that the electronically adjustable regulator valve is connected to an outlet line via a series of conduits, specifically, conduit 28 and conduit 27. See Zlokovitz, Fig. 1. However, in order for fluid to pass from the electronically adjustable regulator valve to an outlet line via the suggested path, the fluid would also pass through the pilot valve. Fluid traveling from the electronically adjustable regulator valve along conduit 28 enters the pilot valve on one side (an upper side of the diaphragm in Fig. 1) of the diaphragm 23. Conduit 27, on the other hand, provides fluid to the pilot valve at another (lower) side of the diaphragm. Thus, fluid traveling from the electronically adjustable regulator valve through conduit 28 cannot reach conduit 27 because Zlokovitz teaches no way for the fluid to pass through the diaphragm.

To the contrary, Zlokovitz teaches venting fluid from the electronically adjustable regulator valve to the atmosphere through line 51. See Zlokovitz, Fig. 1. As a result, Zlokovitz fails to disclose an exhaust line connecting a servo control valve assembly to an outlet line, the exhaust line carrying fluid at an exhaust pressure from the servo control valve assembly to the outlet line, as is recited by each of claims 1, 3, and 5. Thus, the applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3, and 5.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

The applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 4 as obvious over Zlokovitz in view of Great Britain Patent Application No. GB 2,252,848 to Yonnet ("Yonnet"). To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, "the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." M.P.E.P. § 2143. The cited art fails to disclose or suggest all claim limitations. In particular, Zlokovitz and Yonnet fail to disclose or suggest an exhaust pressure solenoid valve.

The applicant agrees with the Patent office in that Zlokovitz fails to disclose an exhaust solenoid. See the official action, page 3. While Yonnet discloses a gas supply pressure control apparatus including an active governor controlled by a pilot valve which is, in turn, at least partially controlled by an electronic control means through two valves 56, 58, Yonnet does not teach or suggest that valves 56, 58 are solenoid valves. In fact, Yonnet fails to disclose or suggest solenoid valves of any

sort. Thus, Yonnet cannot disclose or suggest an exhaust pressure solenoid valve as is recited by claim 4. As a result, claim 4 cannot be rendered obvious by any combination of Zlokovitz and Yonnet. The applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 4.


CONCLUSION

The applicant respectfully requests entry of the foregoing amendments and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, and 14. Enclosed herewith is a petition for a one month extension of time and the requisite fee. No other fees are believed due at this time. However, if there are any other fees or refunds required, the Commissioner is directed to charge or debit Deposit Account No. 13-2855 of Marshall, Gerstein & Borun LLP. A copy of this paper is enclosed herewith.

If there are matters that can be discussed by telephone to further the prosecution of this application, the applicant respectfully requests that the examiner call its attorney at the number listed below.

Dated: February 9, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Michael A. Chinlund

Registration No.: 55,064
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300
Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300
Agent for Applicant